

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 4-7 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 4-7 can be found, for example, in the present specification at paragraphs [0012], [0017], [0025], and [0027], and in previously presented claims 1 and 4-7. No new matter is added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Ikeda, Fukuoka, and Azuma

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5 and 8-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over WO 03/087023 to Ikeda et al. ("Ikeda")* in view of JP 2003-272857 to Fukuoka et al. ("Fukuoka"), and JP 2000-007604 to Azuma et al. ("Azuma"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 is set forth above. Ikeda, Fukuoka, and Azuma do not disclose or suggest such a device.

In view of the amendments to claim 1 set forth above, formula (I) of claim 1 does not encompass compounds (A1) and (A2) of Ikeda, and formula (II) of claim 1 does not encompass compound (B10) of Ikeda. Accordingly, the compounds of Ikeda identified in the Office Action (*see* pages 6 to 7) are not compounds according to formulae (I) to (IX) of claim 1.

While Fukuoka discloses a laminate having a structure similar to that recited in claim 1, Fukuoka does not disclose a light emitting layer including the combination of one or more compounds of formulae (I) to (IX) and a compound of formula (iii) according to the requirements set forth in claim 1. In Example 1 of Fukuoka and Comparative Example 1 of

* Discussion of Ikeda is made with reference to U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0214565, which the Office Action asserts is an English-language equivalent of Ikeda.

the present specification, DPVDPAN is used as a host material. *See* present specification, paragraph [0084]. Comparing Comparative Example 1 and Examples of the present specification, it is apparent that all of the Examples exhibit better thermal stability and strikingly prolonged lifetime in comparison to Comparative Example 1. *See* present specification, paragraph [0086] (Table 1).

Azuma does not disclose a light emitting layer including a compound according to formulae (I) to (IX) of claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Ikeda, Fukuoka, and Azuma do not disclose or suggest a light emitting layer including the combination of one or more compounds of formulae (I) to (IX) and a compound of formula (iii) according to the requirements set forth in claim 1, or the advantageous effect resulting therefrom. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been led to the particular combination of features recited in claim 1 by the teachings of Ikeda, Fukuoka, and Azuma.

As explained, claim 1 would not have been rendered obvious by Ikeda, Fukuoka, and Azuma. Claims 2-4 and 8-20 depend from claim 1 and, thus, also would not have been rendered obvious by Ikeda, Fukuoka, and Azuma. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

B. Ikeda, Fukuoka, Azuma, and Suzuki

The Office Action rejects claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ikeda in view of Fukuoka, Azuma, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0177009 to Suzuki et al. ("Suzuki"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

For the reasons discussed above, Ikeda, Fukuoka, and Azuma do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Suzuki does not remedy the deficiencies of Ikeda, Fukuoka, and Azuma. Suzuki is cited for its alleged disclosure of an organic luminescent

device including an asymmetric pyrene compound. *See* Office Action, page 10. However, in view of the amendments to claim 1 set forth herein, compound 27 of Suzuki, which is relied on in the Office Action (*see* pages 10 to 12), does not fall within the scope of formula (V) of claim 1. Accordingly, Suzuki, like Ikeda, Fukuoka, and Azuma, fails to disclose or suggest a light emitting layer including the combination of one or more compounds of formulae (I) to (IX) and a compound of formula (iii) according to the requirements set forth in claim 1, or the advantageous effect resulting therefrom. The combination of references fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1.

As explained, claim 1 would not have been rendered obvious by Ikeda, Fukuoka and Suzuki. Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1 and, thus, also would not have been rendered obvious by Ikeda, Fukuoka and Suzuki. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

C. Aziz, Shi, Fukuoka, and Azuma

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 8-15, 17, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over EP 1385221 to Aziz et al. ("Aziz") in view of EP 1009044 to Shi et al. ("Shi"), Fukuoka, and Azuma. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 is set forth above. Aziz, Shi, Fukuoka, and Azuma do not disclose or suggest such a device.

As conceded in the Office Action, Aziz does not specifically disclose asymmetric compounds falling within the scope of claim 1. *See* Office Action, pages 13 to 14. However, the Office Action relies on Shi for its disclosure of particular compounds. The compounds of Shi, however, are compounds for a hole transport layer. The luminescent region described in Aziz includes a hole transport zone, a light emitting zone, and an electron transport zone. *See* Aziz, paragraph [0010]. To the extent that a skilled artisan would incorporate the

compounds of the Shi into the structures of Aziz, the compounds would be used in the hole transport zone of Aziz (not a light emitting layer). Thus, Aziz and Shi do not disclose or suggest a light emitting layer including the combination of one or more compounds of formulae (I) to (IX) and a compound of formula (iii) according to the requirements set forth in claim 1.

It is shown above that Fukuoka and Azuma also do not disclose or suggest a light emitting layer including the combination of one or more compounds of formulae (I) to (IX) and a compound of formula (iii) according to the requirements set forth in claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Aziz, Shi, Fukuoka, and Azuma do not disclose or suggest a light emitting layer including the combination of one or more compounds of formulae (I) to (IX) and a compound of formula (iii) according to the requirements set forth in claim 1, or the advantageous effect resulting therefrom. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been led to the particular combination of features recited in claim 1 by the teachings of Aziz, Shi, Fukuoka, and Azuma.

As explained, claim 1 would not have been rendered obvious by Aziz, Shi, Fukuoka, and Azuma. Claims 2-5, 8-15, 17, 19, and 20 depend from claim 1 and, thus, also would not have been rendered obvious by Aziz, Shi, Fukuoka, and Azuma. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

D. Aziz, Shi, Fukuoka, Azuma, and Ikeda

The Office Action rejects claims 16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Aziz in view of Shi, Fukuoka, Azuma, and Ikeda. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

For the reasons discussed above, Aziz, Shi, Fukuoka, and Azuma do not disclose or suggest disclose or suggest a light emitting layer including the combination of one or more compounds of formulae (I) to (IX) of claim 1 and a compound of formula (iii) of claim 1

according to the requirements set forth in claim 1. It is likewise shown above that Ikeda does not disclose or suggest a light emitting layer including the combination of one or more compounds of formulae (I) to (IX) and a compound of formula (iii) according to the requirements set forth in claim 1. Accordingly, the combination of references fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1.

As explained, claim 1 would not have been rendered obvious by Aziz, Shi, Fukuoka, Azuma, and Ikeda. Claims 16 and 18 depend from claim 1 and, thus, also would not have been rendered obvious by Aziz, Shi, Fukuoka, Azuma, and Ikeda. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Richard L. Treanor
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 36,379

Jacob A. Doughty
Registration No. 46,671

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 07/09)